

REMARKS

Claims 1–7 and 9–20 are pending. By this paper, claims 12–17 and 20 are amended. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. The following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any particular reference and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited art. Further, Applicant does not admit any assertion made in the Office Action characterizing the cited art that is not specifically addressed herein.

Applicant provisionally elects Group I, claims 1–7, 9–11, and 16, drawn to a disruptor including a wall of the projectile locatable at anyone of a number of positions, with traverse. Claims 17–20 are amended to depend from claim 1. As such, Applicant notes that claims 17–20 should be included in the elected claims corresponding to Group I. Thus, it is respectfully asserted that claims 1–7, 9–11, and 16–20 are the elected claims.

In addition, claims 12–15 are amended to provide a genus method claim, which eliminates the basis of the Restriction Requirement in Groups II and III. The method claims are implemented by the disruptor of Group I so the two claim sets relate to a common inventive concept. Therefore, the reasons stated by the Examiner in support of the Restriction Requirement are no longer applicable. A restriction is proper only if the claims are able to support separate patents and they are either independent or distinct.

It is also respectfully submitted that the subject matter of all claims 1–7 and 9–20 is sufficiently related that a through search for the subject matter of any one group of claims would encompass a search for the subject matter of the remaining claims. Thus, it is respectfully

submitted that the search and examination of the entire application could be made without serious burden. See MPEP §803 in which it is stated that "if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions" (emphasis added). It is respectfully submitted that this policy should apply in the present application to avoid unnecessary delay and expense to Applicant and duplicative examination by the Patent Office.

Thus, withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested. In the event of any questions, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate a telephone conversation with the undersigned representative.

Dated this 15th day of December 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffery M. Lillywhite/ Reg. #53,220
JEFFERY M. LILLYWHITE

Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 53,220
Customer No. 022913
Telephone No. 801.533.9800

JML0000000029V001.DOC